CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.567
24 July 1990

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE FIVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 24 July 1990, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Bogumil Sujka (Poland)

GE.90-62358/2213B

The PRESIDENT: I declare open the 567th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

In accordance with its programme of work, the Conference continues today its consideration of agenda item 4, "Chemical weapons". In conformity with rule 30 of the rules of procedure, however, any member wishing to do so may raise any subject relevant to the work of the Conference.

As the Conference has received requests from non-member States to participate in our work, once the list of speakers is exhausted, we shall hold an informal meeting in order to consider those requests. We shall immediately afterwards resume the plenary meeting to formalize any decisions arrived at in the informal meeting. I should like to recall also that, after the plenary proceedings are concluded, the Conference will hold an informal meeting on the substance of agenda item 3, "Prevention of nuclear war, including all related matters".

I have on my list of speakers for today the representatives of Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria and Egypt.

I now give the floor to the representative of Yugoslavia, Ambassador Kosin.

Mr. KOSIN (Yugoslavia): Mr. President, may I, at the outset, tell you how pleased I am to see you, my personal friend and outstanding representative of friendly Poland, as the President of the Conference of Disarmament for the month of July. Under your skilful presidency the Conference has made an important step forward in the area of nuclear issues and the deliberations in general went on smoothly and fruitfully. Please do accept my delegation's warmest congratulations. At this juncture, I would like to express my gratitude to your predecessor, Ambasador de Rivero, of Peru, who so efficiently led the Conference in June. I am taking the opportunity to welcome in our midst the heads of delegations of Brazil, Ambassador Ricupero; of India, Ambassador Chadha; and of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ambassador von Wagner, and to assure them that they can count on the full co-operation of the Yugoslav delegation. I would also like to express our gratitude to our outgoing colleagues, Ambassador Sharma, Ambassador Bayart, Ambassador Kostov and Ambassador Varga, who all contributed so much to the work of our Conference. I wish them all the best in the future.

The Yugoslav delegation has on several occasions presented its views on the need for a faster shift from arms control to the stage of disarmament measures on all levels of negotiations, in accordance with the positive evolution of international relations.

Of priority importance to my delegation are the developments on the European continent that provide conditions for the interweaving of fundamental values outlined within the Conference on European Security and Co-operation on which relations among European countries should be based. Too much is happening at the same time in the social, inter-State, inter-bloc and intra-bloc relations for us to be able to predict all the aspects of immediate development. However, it could be said that Europe, so far the most divided and most armed continent, has shifted towards multifaceted co-operation, thus

(Mr. Kosin, Yugoslavia)

becoming the key element of general efforts aimed at changing the entirety of international relations. Such an evolution, although its numerous aspects and processes are still at the beginning, is already creating a new reality in the world. This new reality creates a foundation for the elaboration of a more active strategy towards redefining new security concepts in all their important postulates, including the nuclear deterrent, the arms race, and so forth.

It is in this light that we see more favourable conditions for accelerating the pace towards disarmament. Such an assessment is continually being reaffirmed. Although we may differ in opinion as to the extent to which the last summit between the two big Powers has met all our expectations, it seems to us that it basically confirmed the continuity in the disarmament negotiations intentions. We welcome the general accord to conclude, in the near future, agreements on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons, on the limitation of nuclear testing, on the obligation to destroy the bulk of chemical arsenals, on the halting of chemical arms production, on the intensification of negotiations on conventional weapons in Europe, etc. These accords can give strong impulse to the work of our Conference. Although, in our view, less was achieved than had been announced, we wish to believe that the horizon is more clear and that the most important disarmament agreements are at hand's reach. We are heartened by the information offered us by the distinguished Ambassadors, Mr. Burt and Mr. Nazarkin, on bilateral negotiations.

The consensus reached on a number of fundamental issues on the United Nations Disarmament Commission's agenda is encouraging, although it is far below the need of multilateral negotiations. We would like to discern here a more positive attitude to multilateral negotiations in general, which in an improved international climate, should be adjusted to the rhythm of bilateral and regional negotiations. This can primarily be done by making use of the potentials of the Conference. The need for this is ever more felt as the international negotiating agenda on disarmament is expanding to new fields. Therefore, we see no reason why we should not start thinking about our agenda too, which can be done without having to question real priorities. I say "real" not because they are written out in our decalogue, or in the final document of SSOD I, but because in their greater part they are still topical. We would want, for example, conventional weapons and confidence-building measures to be given more attention in our future debate on the Conference's agenda.

While not ignoring any problem on the agenda, our efforts, in the immediate work of our Conference, should continue to be focused on three priority questions, namely, items 1, 4 and 5. By treating these questions in a substantial way, and by making real progress, we can strengthen the role of the Conference. We support, of course, all the efforts to enhance the effectiveness of the Conference by improving its method of work and its organization. However, our credibility will depend, first of all, on how capable we are in solving problems which are ripe for it, in clarifying that which should be clarified as soon as possible and in defining that which should be defined. In doing so we must always keep in mind that our Conference is a negotiating body, the ultimate aim of which is the dialogue on all negotiating, pre-negotiating and deliberative levels, leading to the concluding of disarmament agreements.

(Mr. Kosin, Yugoslavia)

Among these priorities come the negotiations on the convention on chemical weapons, as most promising in being resolved. We believe we are now in a truly critical phase, which cannot even stand slowing down without risking to fall back. We ask ourselves why, after obvious progress in 1987 and 1988, after repeated political impulses from numerous international gatherings in 1989 and 1990, the negotiating pace seems to have been more or less slowed down. Having in mind that the complexity of problems requires workable and durable solutions, we are finding it more and more difficult to see where we now stand. Political consensus is constantly being renewed, commitment of intentions reaffirmed, convergence of views is permanently evolving, the position of main possessors and producers of chemical weapons are practically identical, and still we have the impression we are turning in circles and, at times, even that which seemed agreed upon is questioned.

We do not yet have answers to these questions and they might even be too critically intoned. We have to start, however, asking them instead of being satisfied with marginal advances. This has to be done the more as we believe that the participation of a greater number of non-member States in negotiations, an improved mandate of the Committee itself, the submission of important bilateral documents on the destruction of chemical weapons and production capacities, the generalization of efforts in carrying out trial inspection, the convening of fruitful meetings with chemical industrial representatives - create a realistic basis for speedier work.

We see the two big Powers' agreement on the gradual elimination of chemical weapons and the halting of their production as a confirmation of their orientation towards concluding the multilateral convention we are negotiating in the Conference on Disarmament. The ambiguity on retaining the last stage of destruction of all arsenals poses, however, a number of questions related to the conceptual basis and security purpose of the convention. With no aim of questioning the proclaimed intention whereby such ambiguity serves as an incentive to achieve the convention's universality, we are inclined to believe that in practice it will serve as an incentive to the production and even proliferation of chemical weapons. It is needless to repeat that this will pose many problems related to the security of a number of countries.

The universality of a convention is, of course, vital. It will be effectively achieved only if we offer the international community a good, that is global, undiscriminatory and verifiable convention, acceptable to all countries, first of all from the point of view of undiminished security. The most important element in making it acceptable is precisely an unambiguous engagement towards a total elimination and unconditional ban on chemical weapons.

We feel that the conditions are ripe for the Committee's programme of work to be more intensively focused on those questions that have not yet been sufficiently or that have been reviewed only in passing. Here we refer to questions relating to a precise definition of chemical weapons and all that relates to production plants. It is only on the basis of such definitions that we can secure confidence-building when declaring chemical weapons and production plants. Such definitions are indispensable also in negotiations on the character and scope of verification, as they would indicate what type of

(Mr. Kosin, Yugoslavia)

inspection should be carried out in a given plant. The interesting exchange of opinions at meetings with industry representatives on ad hoc verification, confidentiality and schedules of chemicals are a good basis for work on these questions. This is why we would urge the Ad hoc Committee to speed up negotiations on all of these questions, which would also quicken negotiations on the role, composition and decision-making process of the Executive Council.

Political problems relating to assistance, to protection in case of use or threat of use of chemical weapons and to economic and technological development require immediate action. It is high time also that the President's proposal be taken into more articulate discussion as an already elaborated basis for an agreement on the key issue in article IX. In fact, the division between political and technical questions is only conditional, since that which can seem to be a minor technical question to one country, to another may be an extremely relevant one for its development and future.

In spite of all the uncertainties, the situation can be viewed with certain optimism. I wish to point out that Yugoslavia intends to be an original signatory of the convention.

I believe there is no need to repeat the significance of the Conference's engagement in dealing substantially with the problem of nuclear testing - especially now, in the context of the Fourth NPT Review Conference, which cannot circumvent either element of the non-proliferation régime, including cessation of testing, peaceful exploitation of nuclear energy, nuclear disarmament and so on. As has been repeated several times, the complete cessation of testing, that is the conclusion of a CTBT, would be the most effective single measure in checking the nuclear arms race, the most secure and the shortest way towards nuclear disarmament and the slowing down of the qualitative development of nuclear weapons. In connection with this we should underline the significant work already done by the Ad hoc Group of Scientific Experts on enhancing verification by elaborating a global system of seismic verification, and which is also prepared to test the system's new verification techniques.

The signing of the Protocols on Verification of the so-called threshold agreement is, of course, a measure we welcome. These gradual steps have, however, to be put in a context of predictable advance towards the conclusion of the agreement on a comprehensive ban on all nuclear tests in any environment and for all time. Unfortunately, such an objective has not yet been accepted by all nuclear Powers.

We highly welcome the agreement on setting up the Ad hoc Committee on a NTB, as the culmination of year-long efforts to have the Conference take part in resolving this key issue of nuclear disarmament and so confirm its role in treating nuclear issues. We are grateful to Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, who, together with Ambassador Yamada, successfully carried out consultations which led to a reasonably balanced mandate.

The Conference is a representative enough body that cannot avoid its responsibility in treating this problem, especially now when the time of deep re-evaluation of all military and defence doctrines has begun. We are convinced that the Conference can give a significant contribution to this

(Mr. Kosin, Yugoslavia)

issue in spite of the differences of opinions. We hope that the founding of the Committee will be an opportunity for a genuine debate on this key issue. The mandate itself offers a sufficient framework for a well-structured exchange of views as a basis for next year's substantial work. We believe that this exchange of views should not be a repetition of well-known positions on nuclear disarmament, but a focused, substantial discussion on specific, concrete aspects of the nuclear test ban.

For five years already, in its Committee, the Conference has been dealing with the problem of preventing the arms race in outer space. The results are not only modest, but it is hard to qualify them even as symbolic. We do not wish to underestimate the quality of the debate, the significance of proposals submitted, the clarification of certain problems, but neither to overlook the fact that we are lagging behind the development of space technologies and that there is an increasing number of countries capable of participating in the conquest of space. We are in fact only at the very beginning of a substantial treatment of this complex issue, while very important proposals requiring urgent consideration such as, for example, those relating to the ban of ASAT weapons, satellite immunity, etc., are going past us.

If we cannot take an essential step forward towards full negotiations, we have to do our utmost to at least orient ourselves in two ways. The first would be an elaboration of confidence-building measures, since experience has shown that there, where we cannot negotiate disarmament measures, we can undertake serious preparatory steps through enhancing confidence and security. Many ideas have already been generated in this field such as the proposal to establish "a code of conduct for space activities", for example. The second would be the strengthening of the existing, but insufficient, legal régime, which would, inter alia, lead to avoiding the development and deployment of space weapons and cover measures of verification. The Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, providing specific information about the nature of these objects, should be enhanced both in scope and function.

We welcome the participation of experts in the Committee's work, which raises the debate to a higher level and certainly contributes to a comprehensive understanding of this complex issue.

There are many ideas and proposals in circulation, so that the Committee can as from now embark, without exaggerated ambition, on substantive work, on those problems ripe to be multilaterally considered.

In conclusion, I would wish to point out that this is not a complete review of problems but an effort to see, in the light of the positive evolution in the world, which roads we can, gradually but continually, follow to reach our goals and to see better what our prospects are. Our Conference is a negotiating body on disarmament, but it can and, indeed, must participate also in the elaboration of security concepts and be part of the process of increased institutionalization of international relations. Political processes normally precede disarmament, but disarmament efforts should not stay far behind, as they are inseparable from international relations. If we want to advance on all fronts, then we must give meaning to the contents of

(Mr. Kosin, Yugoslavia)

proclaimed positions on the interaction, interdependence and complementarity of all negotiating efforts, be they bilateral, regional, subregional or multilateral ones.

This is why it does not suffice that we merely keep each other informed, but we have to simultaneously and meaningfully engage ourselves in all areas. Commitments of intentions must become commitments to results. Every effort should have support, but it should also be expanded and enlarged to meet the needs of the entire international community. That is the case with, for example, non-proliferation of chemical weapons and missile technology agreements, for which true solutions can be found only in a wider disarmament context. They cannot be an aim in themselves, not because the aims are debatable, but to avoid uneven responsibility and security.

The effort towards disarmament is today greater and more fundamental than ever in the post-war period, and even perhaps in the entire history of international relations. This is why through more intensive efforts a new dynamic should be generated in accomplishing the true role of the Conference in what can already be qualified as a permanent negotiating effort.

THE PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Yugoslavia for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

I now give the floor to the representative of Romania, Mr. Chirila.

Mr. CHIRILA (Romania) (translated from French): Mr. President, permit me first of all to say how gratified the Romanian delegation is to see you presiding, with such competence and diplomacy, over the work of the Conference on Disarmament for the month of July. Our gratification is all the greater as you represent Poland, a country with which Romania has traditional relations of friendship and co-operation and, in both the distant and the recent past, often similar experience.

There is already every sign that you will be discharging the duties of President under the very best, if not ideal, conditions. In this context, I cannot let this moment go without stressing, for example, the special significance of the establishment during your term as President of the Ad hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban under the chairmanship of Ambassador Donowaki of Japan, whose talents in this respect have so often been emphasized here.

I am delighted to be able to welcome to our midst the heads of delegation who have recently joined the Conference, including Ambassador Králik of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, Ambassador von Wagner of the Federal Republic of Germany and Ambassador Chadha of India. It is with regret and appreciation that we bade farewell to the heads of delegation who have recently left the Conference.

My statement at today's plenary meeting is prompted by the distribution, under the symbol CD/1014, of a working paper with data concerning Romania on matters of relevance to an issue that is the subject of intensive negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament, the future universal convention on the prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons.

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

Delegations now have the document before them. This working paper submitted by our delegation, like other texts containing information on the same topic that have already been submitted by other delegations, reflects the desire of Romania too to contribute to confidence-building and the acceleration of the negotiating process. That is not to say that we are necessarily in favour of a protracted "pre-convention" process: it might, as is already being said, cause us to lose the rhythm or even miss the right moment.

The information that we are presenting in document CD/1014 follows closely the lines of document CD/828, which since April 1988, when it was submitted by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, has provided the reference framework for those undertaking this exercise of more direct contact between the national context and the international context of the problem prior to the realization of the convention.

Our document is divided into two parts. The first part is a compilation of information that is both concise and clear and reiterates declarations that Romania has already made to the Conference, in particular in my statement of 13 February this year. In substance, it says that Romania does not possess chemical weapons, that there are no such weapons on its territory and that my country has no intention of producing or acquiring them either now or in the future. In this context, permit me to remind you that on 19 April this year we also made in the plenary of the Conferene a declaration of Romania's complete readiness to be an original signatory of a universal convention totally banning chemical weapons.

The second part of the working paper submitted by my delegation provides full data on the production, use, import and export of chemical products in Romania. It will be clearly seen that in Romania there is no production of, or, in general, any performance of operations with substances listed in Schedules 1 or 2 of the "rolling text" of the draft convention.

As for Schedule 3, Romania produces 7 substances in 11 plants, in amounts of between 30 and 9,000 tonnes a year. All these products are intended for use within the country as intermediates in the manufacture of medicines, colourings, pesticides and other products of the civilian chemical industry. The document provides information on location and information on production and rated capacities. The data on imports and exports shows that production of the seven substances in question is undertaken solely for internal, civilian use.

Even with a chemical industry which is not on a level with the countries that are highly developed in this sphere, Romania is aware of the responsibilities that it will have to bear in the international system to implement and verify the future universal chemical weapons ban. I would like to take this opportunity to inform the Conference that to a certain extent, with the means currently available, the Romanian authorities have already taken some measures to set up a group of experts who could, when the time comes, take on the activities of a national authority with specific responsibilities for the implementation of, and compliance with the obligations deriving from the future convention. Moreover, we believe that

(Mr. Chirila, Romania)

the working paper that Romania has submitted to the Conference today could well provide a starting point for the national register advocated in the draft convention.

Finally, I wish to emphasize that we are ready to co-operate with all States or international bodies in increasing confidence and transparency in this highly sensitive area, inter alia through the training of specialists in the field of verification for a universal chemical weapons ban.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of Romania for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

I now give the floor to the representative of Bulgaria, Mr. Grozdanov.

Mr. GROZDANOV (Bulgaria): I have asked for the floor in order to make a very brief statement in connection with the circulation of document CD/1017. But before proceeding, may I be allowed to extend to you, Ambassador Sujka, the warm congratulations of my delegation on seeing you in the Chair during the busiest time of the summer session. My delegation would also like to express its appreciation for the work done by your predecessor, Ambassador de Rivero of Peru, in the month of June.

As delegations must be aware, today my delegation has tabled an official document of the Conference on Disarmament entitled "Submission of data in connection with the Convention of the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons". The provision of this data by the Bulgarian Government is intended as a confidence-building measure and is an expression of its profound desire to stimulate negotiation on the speedy conclusion of a chemical weapons convention.

The contents of document CD/1017 speak for themselves. Bulgaria does not have chemical weapons on its territory, either its own or stocks of another party, and has only one chemical, hydrogen cyanide, that falls under the projected scope of the convention.

However, under instructions from my Government, I avail myself of this opportunity to state once again the readiness of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to sign the future chemical weapons convention as soon as it is open for signature. We believe that such statements enhance the prospects for a timely solution of the remaining outstanding issues in the Ad hoc Committee on Chemical Weapons and we expect similar moves by all other States concerned.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Bulgaria for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair.

I now give the floor to the distinguished representative of Egypt.

Mr. KAREM (Egypt): On behalf of Ambassador Elaraby, I would like to make the following statement:

"I have asked for the floor to make a statement on behalf of the Group of 21, but since this is the first time I take the floor during this month, allow me to express my heartfelt congratulations to you for

(Mr. Karem, Egypt)

assuming the presidency during the month of July. I am confident, Mr. President, that under your able and experienced leadership the work of the Conference on Disarmament is in good hands. At the same time, I would like to express to Ambassador de Rivero of Peru and to the delegation of Peru our sincere appreciation for providing able leadership during the month of June. Now I would like to make a statement on behalf of the Group of 21 and the statement reads as follows:

'The Group of 21 takes note of the bilateral agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on destruction and non-production of chemical weapons and on measures to facilitate the multilateral convention on banning chemical weapons signed on 1 June 1990. It considers the decision by the USSR and the United States of America to halt the production of chemical weapons and to start the destruction of their declared chemical weapons stockpiles to be an important and positive step. The Group hopes that this agreement will enter into force in the near future.

However, the Group of 21 regrets the proposed revisions to the present draft convention as contained in CD/CW/WP.303, which will have negative effects because they inter alia put conditions and postpone the decision for the total elimination of chemical weapons, give rights to States based on the possession of chemical weapons and create a situation of legal uncertainty about the scope and the implementation of the multilateral convention. The Group emphasizes that the ultimate goal must be a non-discriminatory convention of universal adherence.

The Group of 21 is convinced that the bilateral agreement should not be the model for a multilateral treaty and believes that there should be no deviation from the principal undertakings in the present draft convention. In this regard, the Group of 21 is of the view that the total destruction of all chemical weapons and chemical weapons production facilities should be unconditional and decided from the very conclusion of the convention, as already provided for in the present draft convention, so that by the end of the 10-year destruction period all chemical weapons and chemical weapons production facilities would be totally eliminated. This undertaking should be without any reservation.

The Group of 21 reaffirms its position that the future convention on chemical weapons should prohibit the use of such weapons under any circumstances from the date the convention enters into force. This undertaking is already provided for in article I, paragraph 3, of the draft convention.

The Group of 21 opposes any measures which are aimed at establishing a non-proliferation régime in the field of chemical weapons. In its view, non-proliferation in all its aspects can only be achieved through a total and comprehensive ban on chemical weapons'.

That concludes the statement on behalf of the Group of 21".

The PRESIDENT: I thank the representative of Egypt for his statement on behalf of the Group of 21, as well as for the kind words addressed to the Chair.

I recognize the distinguished representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Mr. BATSANOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): The Soviet delegation has asked for the floor to clarify certain matters relating to the bilateral Soviet-American agreement on chemical weapons mentioned today by a number of speakers.

First of all, I would like to express our gratification at the fact that, in the statement by the Group of 21, such key provisions in the bilateral agreement as the obligations not to manufacture chemical weapons and to destroy a considerable part of the stocks of these weapons in so far as concerns the USSR and the United States, are viewed as both important and positive. The Soviet delegation shares the hope of the Group of 21 that the bilateral agreement can come into force in the near future.

To contribute towards this, we intend to make every effort for the possible elaboration together with the United States delegation of the documents which are provided for in this bilateral agreement, and in particular the document on inspection procedures.

Permit me to refer now to the proposals contained in the document CD/CW/WP.303. The Soviet delegation shares the view expressed by the distinguished representative of Egypt on behalf of the Group of 21 that as the ultimate goal we must aim at a convention on chemical weapons that is non-discriminatory in nature and universal as regards the range of the parties to it.

But it is precisely to the attainment of that goal that the proposals contained in document CD/CW/WP.303 are directed. We may differ in our views about how best to reach this ultimate goal, what course to take towards it, but as regards the goal itelf, there, I think, there are no differences at all.

I would like to stress too that the proposals contained in this document are already a compromise between what one would think to be irreconcilable positions held by the parties. It is, probably, an axiom that each of us is almost always more pleased by his own initial position, than by the compromise that is reached when positions are merged. But, you know, the essence and the drama of negotiations both lie in the fact that reaching agreements inevitably entails sacrificing positions that seem to us beyond reproach.

In any case, we are for the serious discussion of this proposal and its various aspects and the finding of a mutually acceptable solution.

I do, however, feel that we would be avoiding unnecessary polemics if from the very outset there is some clarity: this proposal does not affect the obligation of complete destruction of chemical weapons set out, as you know, in article I of the draft convention.

(Mr. Batsanov, USSR)

The Soviet delegation would like to confirm its position in favour of an unconditional ban on the use of chemical weapons within the framework of the draft of the future convention.

In conclusion, I think it necessary to emphasize that, as has already repeatedly been declared by the Soviet delegation, by the Soviet Union, including together with the United States, the best long-term solution to the problem of the spread of chemical weapons is, in our view, the conclusion of the convention that we are working on here, that is, a convention on the general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I would just like to make a few brief remarks also directed to the statement we have just heard from the spokesman for the Group of 21. Like my Soviet colleague, the United States has very similar reactions to the comments by the Group of 21 on the bilateral agreement reached between the United States and the USSR in Washington on 1 June. We welcome the comments in the Group of 21 statement which express acceptance and recognition of, I believe the words were, "important and positive" elements in the bilateral agreement, but we also regret that some of the other conclusions seem to be based on misunderstandings or misinterpretations of the intent or of the projected result of what it is we are proposing in CD/CW/WP.303. The United States has asked for an opportunity, hopefully some time during this week and in co-operation with the Soviet Union, to explain in more direct detail what is the purpose and what is the intent of our proposals, especially with regard to the eighth-year review conference and the 98 per cent pause. We hope to have that opportunity, as I indicated, in the very near future. In my association with Ambassador Batsanov's remarks, that does not include his remarks about retaliatory use.

The PRESIDENT: I thank the distinguished representative of the United States for his statement. Does any delegation wish to take the floor at this stage? I see none.

Distinguished representatives, as announced earlier, we shall now suspend the plenary meeting and convene an informal meeting to consider requests from non-members to participate in the work of the Conference. The plenary meeting is suspended.

The meeting was suspended at 11 a.m. and resumed at 11.05 a.m.

The PRESIDENT: The 567th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament is resumed.

May I invite the Conference to take action on document CD/WP.389 relating to the requests from two non-member States to participate in our work. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference adopts the draft decision contained in the note by the President. I hear no objection.

It was so decided.

(The President)

In connection with this decision, I wish to note for the record that the statement made by the President of the Conference at the resumed 534th plenary meeting also applies to the two requests that we have just considered.

I would like to inform you that, owing to some technical reasons of an organizational nature, the Chairman of the Ad hoc Committee on Negative Security Assurances has asked me to inform you that the meeting initially scheduled for Thursday, 26 July, after the plenary meeting, is being postponed until Monday, 30 July, at 3 p.m. The conference room will be indicated in the timetable for next week.

I have no other business for today. Before I adjourn, I should like to recall that after this plenary meeting the Conference will hold an informal meeting on the substance of agenda item 3. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 26 July, at 10 a.m. The plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 11.10 a.m.